

Remarks

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 27, 29, 31-33, 38, 40, 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Babbs et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,475,232. This rejection is traversed.

As pointed out by the Examiner, the deployed stent devices taught by Babbs et al. are designed to keep the blood vessel lumen open. Conversely, the above claims are directed to methods for "occluding" a vascular vessel. Instead of holding the vessel lumen open and permitting blood flow through the lumen, Applicants methods cause full blockage of the vessel lumen. This blockage is discussed throughout the application including, for example at page 32, lines 25-28, and page 28, lines 23-25. To reinforce this point, Applicants have amended claims 27 and 32 to recite that the vessel is indeed blocked.

Claims 37, 39 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Babbs et al. '232 in view of Li U.S. Patent No. 5,512,291. For at least the reasons stated above, the Babbs et al. reference does not render any of the pending claims obvious, and therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is solicited.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early notice of allowance is solicited. If after reviewing this amendment the Examiner feels that any issues remain which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned representative by telephone to arrange an interview to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

By Kenneth A. Gandy
Kenneth A. Gandy, Reg. No. 33,386
Woodard, Emhardt, Moriarty, McNett & Henry LLP
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137
(317) 634-3456